



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,770	01/25/2001	Philip S. Bernard	A-68556/RFT/JJD	7770

7590 03/24/2003
FLEHR HOHBACH TEST
ALBRITTON & HERBERT LLP
Suite 3400
Four Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4187

EXAMINER

TUNG, JOYCE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1637

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2003

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory ActionApplication No.
09/770,770Applicant(s)
Bernard et al.Examiner
Joyce TungArt Unit
1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED Feb 20, 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on Feb 20, 2003. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
please see the attached.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: _____
- Claim(s) objected to: _____
- Claim(s) rejected: claims 1-16
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____
8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1637

1. The response filed 2/20/2003 has been entered.
2. Claims 1-16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guo et al. (Nature Biotechnology, 1997, Vol. 15, pg. 331-335) in view of Southern et al. (6,054,270).

The response argues that Guo et al. do not disclose the use of overlapping probes and Southern et al. do not disclose determining the difference in ΔT_m of two overlapping probes. Southern et al. disclose the overlapping probes used (See column 15 and 16, table 1). Southern et al. also disclose that the mismatch considerably reduced the melting temperature of the hybrids, and conditions were found that the perfectly matched duplex remained whereas the mismatched duplexes had fully melted (See column 11, lines 30-34). Based upon the teachings of Southern et al. as indicated above, the melting temperature of at least two probes from target nucleic acid is determined because as taught by Southern et al. the mismatch considerably reduced the melting temperature of the hybrids, while perfectly matched duplex is remained. The teachings of Southern et al. also teach the difference for each of said at least two probes between the T_m of said target nucleic acid and T_m from control nucleic acid for each of said at least two probes because the considerably reduced melting temperature of the hybrids is the difference between the T_m of said target nucleic acid. Therefore, Southern et al. further teach determining the difference in determined ΔT_m between overlapping probes as an indication of the presence or absence of a sequence alteration in said target nucleic acid as compared to said control nucleic acid as recited in claims 1 and 6. Thus, the rejection is maintained.

Art Unit: 1637

3. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joyce Tung whose telephone number is (703) 305-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM-4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached at (703) 308-1119 on Monday-Friday from 10:00 AM-6:00 PM.

Any inquiries of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Chemical/Matrix receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

4.. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Art Unit 1637 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall I using (703) 305-3014 or 308-4242. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989).

Joyce Tung

丁 丁
March 11, 2003


GARY BENZION, PH.D.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600